

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found at least in original claim 4 and paragraph [0013] of the specification. Claim 9 is added. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over what is alleged to be Applicants' admitted prior art (hereinafter "AAPA") in view of GB No. 2,325,329 to Ahan (hereinafter "Ahan"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,534,809 to Watanabe et al. (hereinafter "Watanabe"). Original claim 4 was previously rejected in the September 19, 2006 Office Action, on page 6, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and in view of Ahan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,483,565 to Hidehira et al. (hereinafter "Hidehira.") The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites that a plurality of first input terminals are provided as the first ends of the plurality of signal-supplying lines and a plurality of second input terminals are provided as the second ends of the plurality of signal-supplying lines. The September 19, 2006 Office Action concedes, on pages 6 and 7, that this feature is not disclosed in Hidehira. However, the Office Action asserts that because Hidehira discloses (col. 4, lines 5-13) supplying gate driving signals to both ends of the scanning lines, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to supply data signals to both ends of the data lines. The Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

Because Hidehira discloses data lines and scanning lines, and further discloses supplying gate driving signals to both ends of the scanning lines, but fails to disclose supplying signals to data lines, it is apparent that Hidehira did not recognize the benefits of supplying image signals to both ends of the data lines, as positively recited in claim 1. In

other words, if it would have been obvious to supply signals to both ends of the data lines, Hidehira would already have done so.

Further, the September 19, 2006 Office Action asserts that a skilled artisan would have been motivated to supply signals to both ends of the data selecting lines to reinforce the signal. However, Hidehira discloses in col. 3, lines 13-20, that supplying signals from both ends reduces signal delay and allows the scanning lines to have a smaller width, and not reinforcing the signal, as asserted in the current Office Action.

Claim 1 further recites that a time in which a first switching element, among the plurality of switching elements, is on is substantially the same to a time in which an adjacent switching element is on. The applied references are silent regarding this feature as positively recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, AAPA, Ahan and Hidehira cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in at least independent claim 1. Further, claim 6 would also not have been suggested by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of this claim on an allowable independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that claim 6 recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over, AAPA, Ahan and Hidehira are respectfully requested.

Claim 9 recites, among other features, a first wiring line extending from the input terminal to the second end, and a second wiring line extending from the first wiring line to the control input terminal. At least this feature cannot reasonably be considered to be taught, or to have been suggested, by the applied prior art references. Ahan teaches that the switching control signal lines SWS1 through SWS3 are commonly connected through a single wire to

the sources of the three transistors MS, respectively. Similarly, Watanabe, in col. 6, lines 45-48, teaches that connections are characterized by an arrangement wherein each, *i.e.*, single signal lines, are used. Neither applied reference teaches a first wiring line extending from the input terminal to the second end, and a second wiring line extending from the first wiring line to the control input terminal, as positively recited in claim 9.

AAPA, Ahan and Hidehira cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in at least independent claim 9.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 6 and 9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkhimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB:GMH/mef

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: April 23, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--